

Anisotropic Node Removal in d-wave Superconductors under Magnetic Field

Efrain J. Ferrer and Vivian de la Incera

Physics Department, State University of New York at Fredonia, Fredonia, NY 14063, USA

A phenomenological model that considers different secondary id_{xy} gap amplitudes and quasiparticle effective charges for each nodal direction, is proposed to explain the observed anisotropic node removal by a magnetic field in high- T_c cuprates. Two independent parity-breaking condensates $\langle \bar{\Psi}_i \wedge \Psi_i \rangle$ develop, implying the induction of a magnetic moment per each nodal direction. The model outcomes are in agreement with the experimentally found relation $\Delta_i \sim \sqrt{B}$. The secondary gap vanishes through a second-order phase transition at a critical temperature whose value for underdoped nodal-oriented YBCO is estimated to be $\sim 6K$ for a field of $15T$.

PACS numbers: 74.20.Rp; 74.20.-z; 74.72.-h

Thanks to a wealth of experiments and theoretical studies on high T_c cuprates, it has become clear that any viable theory of high- T_c superconductivity should incorporate, beside the superconducting and normal phases, several other ordered phases that may be externally induced or spontaneously generated, and can either coexist or compete.

The idea of the existence of competing ground states and quantum critical points in high- T_c cuprates was used by Votja, Zhang and Sachdev [1, 2] to explain an observed anomalously large damping rate of quasiparticles near the gap nodes of the $Bi_2Sr_2CaCu_2O_{8+\delta}$ superconductor. The quasiparticle damping rate, studied in photoemission spectroscopy (ARPES) [3] and optical conductivity [4] experiments, revealed a linear in temperature dependence, in contrast to the cubic dependence expected in the conventional d-wave picture [5]. This anomalous enhancement of the rate was considered in Ref. [1, 2] to be associated to a quantum critical behavior and interpreted as the result of the fluctuations of a new, secondary order parameter that removed the quasiparticle nodes. Then, a phenomenological theory of nodal quasiparticles coupled to the fluctuations of a secondary (is or id_{xy}) pairing order parameter was proposed, and evidence of a quantum critical point in the superconducting phase was provided within a perturbative ϵ -expansion in Ref. [2]. This quantum critical point was later established beyond perturbation theory by Khveshchenko and Passke [6], finding a damping rate $\sim T$ at high temperatures.

The development of a new order parameter has been also found in tunneling experiments with $YBa_2Cu_3O_{7-x}$ (YBCO) [7]. In these studies, a splitting of the zero bias conductance peak (ZBCP) is observed, when a magnetic field is perpendicularly applied to the CuO_2 planes of the YBCO films. A ZBCP is associated to the presence of nodes, as it reflects the existence of Andreev surface bound states at and near the Fermi surface [8]. Hence, the splitting of the ZBCP may be an indication of the appearance of a secondary gap, and therefore of node removal by the magnetic field. In addition to the field induced splitting of the ZBCP, a spontaneous -probably associated to the doping level- splitting was also seen in [7].

These findings motivated Dagan and Deutscher [9] to perform a comprehensive study of the doping dependence of the ZBCP splitting in YBCO samples with and without external magnetic field. These authors concluded that above certain doping level near optimum doping, a spontaneous ZBCP splitting occurs, which increases with doping. It also increases with magnetic field applied along the c-axis. In underdoped samples the magnetic field could induce the ZBCP splitting, but no spontaneous splitting was observed.

Although the ZBCP splitting by the magnetic field may be considered as due to node removal, a different explanation, based on Doppler shift of the Andreev bound states has been also offered [10]. However, a new set of experiments [11] has definitely favored node removal in the case of underdoped materials, measured in decreasing fields to eliminate hysteresis effects. In these experiments a large ZBCP splitting was clearly observed in films with thickness smaller than the London penetration depth. That is, under conditions where the Doppler shift effect is negligible. Another important finding of Ref. [11] is that the splitting is very anisotropic. Only for samples having (1,1,0) orientation, the splitting was substantial. The authors of [11] noticed that the experimental data obtained for the (1,1,0) oriented samples were in good agreement with the predictions made by Laughlin [12] in a model he had proposed some years ago to explain the behavior of the thermal conductivity of cuprates in a magnetic field [13]. However, they also called attention that at present there is no theoretical model that predicts the observed anisotropy. Laughlin model, which is based on a transition from a pure d-wave order parameter to a parity and time-reversal symmetry violating $d_{x^2-y^2} + id_{xy}$ ground state, removes the nodes of both nodal directions.

It should be mentioned that the behavior of the thermal conductivity of cuprates with a magnetic field has proven itself to be anisotropic too. The hallmark of Krishana *et al.* effect [13], namely, the decreasing of the thermal conductivity with the magnetic field, followed by a kink and a plateau region, is indeed observed in only one of the two nodal orientations [14]. This striking result was revealed, after a long debate, by careful

experiments realized by Ando *et al.* [14]. Anisotropic in-plane transport properties of cuprates have been also observed by Ando and coworkers in measurements of the electrical resistivity of underdoped samples [15] and of the magnetoresistance of lightly doped ones [16]. These experimental findings have indicated that the anisotropy between the nodal directions is related to the presence of charge stripes along the nodal directions of these materials. Thus, the electrons organize in an anisotropic macroscopic state, characterized by stripes that depend on the temperature and doping.

In this paper we propose a phenomenological model for the low-energy quasiparticle excitations at the nodes of a superconductor on which both magnetic field and doping can induce the transition from the regular d-wave pairing to $d_{x^2-y^2} + id_{xy}$ - or $d_{x^2-y^2} + is$ -pairings. The novel feature of the present model is that it incorporates the observed anisotropy of the nodal directions, so it can describe the anisotropic field-induced ZBCP splitting phenomenon [9, 15]. Two main new ideas have been implemented here: (1) to consider the induction of a secondary order parameter with id_{xy} (or is) symmetry that may have different amplitudes along the two nodal directions, and, (2) inspired by the above mentioned anisotropic charge distribution along the nodal directions, to allow for different effective charges of the quasiparticle excitations about these directions.

Our treatment will follow the standard procedure based on the rotationally covariant Nambu representation, employed in Refs. [1, 2] and [6], to describe the quasiparticles in terms of two species of Nambu bispinors. Then, the bispinors are combined in four-component Dirac spinors, which permit to write the action in a familiar field theory form. Following Lee and Wen [17], we assume that the spectrum of the quasiparticle excitations in the superconductor is given by $E(k) = \sqrt{\epsilon(k) + \Delta^2(k)}$. Here $\epsilon(k) = 2t(\cos(bk_x) + \cos(bk_y))$, as usual. For the proposed complex order parameter $\langle c_{\mathbf{k}\uparrow} c_{-\mathbf{k}\downarrow} \rangle = \Delta(k)$, however, we propose a secondary id_{xy} component characterized by two amplitudes Δ_{ixy} , ($i = 1, 2$), one for each nodal direction, given by $\Delta(k) = \Delta_0(\cos(bk_x) - \cos(bk_y)) + i\Delta_{1xy} \sin(bk_x) \sin(bk_y) [\sin^2(\frac{b}{2}(k_x - k_{1x})) \sin^2(\frac{b}{2}(k_y - k_{1y})) + \sin^2(\frac{b}{2}(k_x + k_{1x})) \sin^2(\frac{b}{2}(k_y + k_{1y}))] + (1 \leftrightarrow 2)$, where $\pm k_i = \pm(k_F, \pm k_F)$ are the momentum of the nodes along the two nodal directions. A similar order parameter can be used to produce is secondary pairing, by substituting the factor $\sin(bk_x) \sin(bk_y)$ by 1 in $\Delta(k)$. From now on we concentrate our discussion on the id_{xy} , as the results can be easily extended to the is case. Our guidance to propose such a form of the secondary order parameter has been to use a basis function that transforms under the symmetry group of the superconductor $C_{4v} \times Z_2$ [18] in the same way as the usual id_{xy} basis function.

Rotating the coordinate system by $\pi/4$ and expanding

about each nodal point up to linear order, one can write the low energy effective action of the quasiparticle excitations around the nodes as the sum of a fermion kinetic term

$$S_\varphi = i \sum_{\alpha=\uparrow}^{\downarrow} \int d^3x [\bar{\varphi}_{1\alpha} (\gamma_0 \partial^0 + v_F \gamma_x \partial^x + v_\Delta \gamma_y \partial^y) \varphi_{1\alpha} + (\varphi_{1\alpha} \rightarrow \tilde{\varphi}_{2\alpha}, x \longleftrightarrow y)], \quad (1)$$

a Higgs-Yukawa (HY) term

$$S_{\varphi\phi} = \int d^3x [g\phi_1 \sum_{\alpha=\uparrow}^{\downarrow} \bar{\varphi}_{1\alpha} \varphi_{1\alpha} + g\phi_2 \sum_{\alpha=\uparrow}^{\downarrow} \bar{\varphi}_{2\alpha} \tilde{\varphi}_{2\alpha}], \quad (2)$$

and a scalar field action, whose generic form can be found, after integrating out high-energy fermion modes, to be

$$S_\phi = \int d^3x [\frac{1}{2\bar{c}^2} (\partial_0 \phi_1)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \phi_1)^2 - m^2 \phi_1^2 - \lambda \frac{\phi_1^4}{4!} + \frac{1}{2\bar{c}^2} (\partial_0 \phi_2)^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\nabla \phi_2)^2 - m^2 \phi_2^2 - \lambda \frac{\phi_2^4}{4!}] \quad (3)$$

In the above equations m, λ, g and $\bar{c}$ are undetermined parameters to be fixed by the experiment, $v_F = 2\sqrt{2}tb$ and $v_\Delta = \frac{b\Delta_0}{\sqrt{2}}$ are the characteristics velocities of the d-wave superconductor, and $g\phi_1 \equiv \Delta_{1xy}$ and $g\phi_2 \equiv \Delta_{2xy}$. We are using the irreducible representation $\gamma_\mu = (\tau_2, i\tau_1, -i\tau_3)$, $\mu = 0, 1, 2$, of the (2+1)-dimensional Dirac algebra, where τ_i are the Pauli matrices. The quasiparticle states near the pairs of the opposite nodes have been described in terms of the bispinors $\varphi_{i\alpha} = (c_\alpha(k_i), \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta} c_\alpha^\dagger(-k_i))$, with $\tilde{\varphi}_{2\alpha} = \frac{\tau_1 + \tau_3}{\sqrt{2}} \varphi_{2\alpha}$, and we introduced the conjugates $\bar{\varphi}_{1\alpha} = \varphi_{1\alpha}^\dagger \gamma_0$, $\bar{\tilde{\varphi}}_{2\alpha} = \tilde{\varphi}_{2\alpha}^\dagger \gamma_0$. The index $\alpha = \uparrow, \downarrow$ denotes the two spin components, and $\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta}$ is an antisymmetric tensor with $\varepsilon_{\uparrow\downarrow} = 1$.

To make the fermion sector of the action explicitly Lorentz invariant, we can make the variable change $x \rightarrow \sqrt{\frac{v_F}{v_\Delta}} x$, $y \rightarrow \sqrt{\frac{v_\Delta}{v_F}} y$, in the terms with the $\varphi_{1\alpha}$ field, and $x \rightarrow \sqrt{\frac{v_\Delta}{v_F}} x$, $y \rightarrow \sqrt{\frac{v_F}{v_\Delta}} y$, in those with the field $\tilde{\varphi}_{2\alpha}$. In this way, $v = \sqrt{v_F v_\Delta}$ plays the role of the speed of light. From now on, for simplicity, we set all the velocities to 1.

At this point it is convenient to consider a reducible 4×4 representation of the Dirac algebra by introducing the matrices $\Gamma_\mu = \text{diag}(\gamma_\mu, -\gamma_\mu)$, and combining the bispinors of each nodal direction in four-component Dirac spinors, to form two four-spinors of different "flavors" $i = 1, 2$ defined as $\Psi_1 = (\varphi_{1\uparrow}, \varphi_{1\downarrow})$, $\Psi_2 = (\tilde{\varphi}_{2\uparrow}, \tilde{\varphi}_{2\downarrow})$ with conjugate $\bar{\Psi}_i = \Psi_i^\dagger \Gamma_0$. Notice that the i^{th} Dirac spinor involves the fields of the i^{th} nodal direction only. In the 4×4 representation the action becomes

$$S = \int d^3x \sum_{i=1}^2 [\bar{\Psi}_i \Gamma_\mu \partial^\mu \Psi_i + g\phi_i \bar{\Psi}_i \Lambda \Psi_i]$$

$$+\frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu\phi_i)^2 - m^2\phi_i^2 - \lambda\frac{\phi_i^4}{4!}] \quad (4)$$

where $\Lambda = i\Gamma_0\Gamma_1\Gamma_2 = \text{diag}(I_2, -I_2)$. The action (4) is invariant under parity transformations

$$(x \rightarrow -x, y \rightarrow y), \phi_i \rightarrow -\phi_i, \Psi_i \rightarrow \Gamma_P \Psi_i \quad (5)$$

with $\Gamma_P = \tau_1 \otimes \tau_1$.

Let us now switch on a magnetic field along the c -axis. As mentioned above, an important point of the proposed model is to consider that the effective charges of the two nodal directions are different. Thus, the magnetic field couples with different strengths e_1 and e_2 to fields Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 respectively. Then, in the presence of the magnetic field the action (4) takes the form

$$S_B = \int d^3x \sum_{i=1}^2 [\bar{\Psi}_i \Gamma_\mu D_i^\mu \Psi_i + g\phi_i \bar{\Psi}_i \Lambda \Psi_i + \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu\phi_i)^2 - m^2\phi_i^2 - \lambda\frac{\phi_i^4}{4!}] \quad (6)$$

where $D_i^\mu = \partial_\mu - ie_i A_\mu^{\text{ext}}$, and we take a gauge on which $A_\mu^{\text{ext}} = (0, 0, Bx_1)$. If due to the magnetic field the scalar field acquires nonzero vacuum expectation value (vev) $\hat{\phi}_i$ (induced secondary energy gap), the corresponding i^{th} -parity symmetry is broken. To explore such a possibility it is needed to minimize the free energy of the system

with respect to $\hat{\phi}_i$. In the lowest approximation, it gets contributions from all tadpole diagrams of the effective theory. At finite temperature the minimum equation is

$$2m^2\phi + \frac{\lambda}{6}\phi^3 = -\frac{\hbar}{8\pi^2\beta}\lambda\phi_i \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \int d^2k \frac{1}{\left(\frac{2n\pi}{\beta}\right)^2 + k^2 + m^2 + \lambda\frac{\phi_i^2}{2}} + \hbar\frac{2g^2|e_i B|\phi_i}{\pi\beta} \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\left(\frac{(2n+1)\pi}{\beta}\right)^2 + 2|e_i B|l + g^2\phi_i^2} \quad (7)$$

where $\beta^{-1} = T$, and, to simplify the notation, we dropped the use of the "hat" in the scalar vev's.

Since this is an effective low-energy theory of quasiparticle excitations around the nodes, the low-energy domain will be limited by the induced gap. Therefore, the divergent integrals should have cutoff Δ_i . Moreover, it is natural to expect a magnetically induced gap smaller than the field generating it. As a consequence, the fermion infrared dynamics will be dominated by the lowest Landau level, and the leading contribution to the fermion tadpole, second term in the *RHS* of (7), will come from $l = 0$. Thereby, after doing the temperature sums, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{3g\alpha^2}\Delta_i^3 + \frac{\hbar}{8\pi\alpha}g\Delta_i^2 + \frac{\hbar}{2\pi}\frac{g\Delta_i}{\alpha^2}\sqrt{\frac{\Delta_i^2}{\alpha^2} + T^2}e^{(-\frac{\Delta_i}{2\alpha T})} - \hbar\frac{g|e_i B|}{\pi}\tanh\left(\frac{\Delta_i}{2T}\right) = 0 \quad (8)$$

In (8) we took $m^2 = 0$, and introduced the notation $\alpha \equiv \sqrt{\frac{2g^2}{\lambda}}$. Eq. (8) can have different field-dependent solutions, for different ranges of λ and g . However, to describe the experimental findings, we need to consider the parameter range that leads to $\Delta_i \sim \sqrt{|e_i B|}$ [11]. Such a solution can be found neglecting the first term in the *LHS* of (8), which corresponds to neglect the contribution of the tree-level $\lambda\phi^4$ term in the free-energy. In this way, the zero-temperature minimum results

$$\Delta_i^{(0)} = 2\sqrt{\alpha}\sqrt{2|e_i B|}. \quad (9)$$

Experiments with YBCO samples gives the ratio $\frac{\Delta_i^{(0)}}{\sqrt{B}} = 1.1\text{meV}/T^{1/2}$ in data taken in decreasing fields [11]. Reinstating the superconductor characteristic velocity in (9) through the change $e_i B \rightarrow (\hbar v^2/c)e_i B$, using $\hbar v \simeq 0.25\text{eV}\text{\AA}$ for YBCO, and $e_i = e$ for one of the nodal directions we find $\alpha \simeq 0.13$. It can be checked that this result is not in contradiction with the dropping of the

cubic term in (8).

We underline that the solution (9) is the only extremal at zero temperature. That is, $\Delta_i^{(0)} = 0$ is not even an extremal of the free-energy at $T = 0$. Moreover, the breaking of the symmetry by the magnetic field at $T = 0$ occurs independently of the strength of the Yukawa coupling g , *i.e.* there is no critical g in this case.

A similar zero temperature behavior was previously found in our studies of a (3+1)-dimensional HY model in the presence of a magnetic field [19, 20]. However, there is a fundamental difference between that case and the one we are considering here. In the model of Refs. [19, 20], the magnetic field breaks a discrete chiral symmetry producing a chiral condensate $\langle\bar{\Psi}\Psi\rangle$. Such a symmetry breaking is a manifestation of the phenomenon, introduced by Gusynin, Miransky, and Shovkovy [21], of magnetic catalysis of chiral symmetry breaking (MCCSB) [22]. The MCCSB mechanism has been suggested as a possible explanation for several transport properties of

strongly correlated electronic systems [23]. Nevertheless, in the id_{xy} theory considered in the present paper, the condensation phenomenon has a different physical character, since the Lagrangian (4) has explicitly broken chiral symmetry due to the HY term. As it happens in MCCSB, here too the fermion infrared dynamics in the presence of a magnetic field induces the appearance of a gap and a fermion-antifermion condensate, but in this case it is a parity-breaking condensate $\langle \bar{\Psi} \wedge \Psi \rangle$, instead of the chiral condensate $\langle \bar{\Psi} \Psi \rangle$ associated to the MCCSB. We call this new mechanism of magnetic-field-induced dynamical symmetry breaking: magnetic catalysis of parity symmetry breaking. Physically, the parity condensate corresponds to the induction of a magnetic moment by the magnetic field. The induction of a magnetic moment was proposed by Laughlin [12] as the key to explain the odd behavior of the thermal conductivity at $B \neq 0$ in high- T_c superconductors [13, 14].

As it is known, thermal effects tend to erase the generated condensates. In the present case, this is reflected in the tendency of the gap solution to vanishing ($\Delta_i(T) \rightarrow 0$) as T is increased. That is, we find that at some critical temperature T_{ci} , that depends on the magnetic field, a second order phase transition takes place from a gapped to a gapless state for the i^{th} nodal direction, independently of what occurs in the other nodal direction. Near the transition temperature T_{ci} the gap solution can be written as

$$\Delta_i(T) = \frac{4}{\alpha T} (T_{ci}^2 - T^2) \quad (10)$$

with $T_{ci} = \alpha \sqrt{|e_i B|} = (\sqrt{\alpha/8}) \Delta_i^{(0)}$. Using the gap $\Delta_i^{(0)} = 4meV$, which corresponds to a field of 15T in the 600Å film of underdoped (1,1,0)-oriented YBCO, measured in decreasing field [11], we estimate a critical temperature $T_c \simeq 6K$.

Finally, we would like to comment on the anisotropic behavior of the proposed model in the presence of a magnetic field. As seen from Eq. (9), the induced gap $\Delta_i(T)$ and the critical temperature T_{ci} of the i^{th} nodal direction depend on the strength of the effective charge e_i of the quasiparticles of that particular direction. The smaller the effective charge e_i , the smaller the $\Delta_i(T)$ and the T_{ci} . Then, given a magnetic field B , we have that for $T_{c2}(B) \leq T \leq T_{c1}(B)$ no ZBCP splitting will be observed if the film is oriented along direction 2, but it will be present for films oriented along 1. In this sense, it would be interesting to have available data of ZBCP measurements taken along the nodal direction perpendicular to the one used in [11], as in that case one could use the relation $e_2 = (\frac{T_{c2}}{T_{c1}})^2 e_1$ to estimate the ratio of the two effective charges. We think that this anisotropic condensation mechanism is also the basis to explain the anisotropic transport properties in underdoped supercon-

ducting samples [13, 14, 15, 16].

This research was supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. PHY-0070986.

-
- [1] M. Votja, Y. Zhang, and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B **62** 6721 (2000).
 - [2] M. Votja, Y. Zhang, and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85** 4940 (2000).
 - [3] T. Valla *et al.*, Science **285**, 2110 (1999).
 - [4] J. Corson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2569 (2000).
 - [5] S. M. Quinlan, D. J. Scalapino, and N. Bulut, Phys. Rev. B **49** 1470 (1994); M. L. Titov, A. G. Yashenkin, and D. N. Aristov, *ibid* **52**, 10626 (1995).
 - [6] D. V. Khveshchenko, and J. Paaske, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 4672 (2001).
 - [7] M. Covington *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 277 (1997); M. Aprili, E. Badica, and L. H. Greene, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4630 (1999); R. Krupke and G. Deutscher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4634 (1999).
 - [8] C. R. Hu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72** 1526 (1994); S. Kashiwaya *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **51** 1350 (1995).
 - [9] Y. Dagan and G. Deutscher, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** 177004 (2001).
 - [10] M. Fofgelström, D. Rainer, and J. A. Sauls, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 281 (1997).
 - [11] Y. Dagan and G. Deutscher, Phys. Rev. B **64** 092509 (2001); R. Beck *et al.*, cond-mat/0212447.
 - [12] R.B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80** 5188 (1998).
 - [13] K. Krishana *et al.*, Science **277**, 83 (1997).
 - [14] Y. Ando *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88** 147004 (2002).
 - [15] Y. Ando *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88** 137005 (2002).
 - [16] Y. Ando, A. N. Lavrov, and S. Komiya, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90** 247003 (2003).
 - [17] P. A. Lee and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** 4111 (1997).
 - [18] J. Annett, N. Goldenfeld, and A. J. Leggett, Physical Properties of High Tc Superconductors, edited by D.M. Ginsberg (World Scientific, Singapore, 1996), Vol.5.
 - [19] E.J. Ferrer and V. de la Incera, Phys.Lett.B **481**, 287 (2000); V. de la Incera, in Proc. of the Intern. Conf. on Quantization, Gauge Theory, and Strings, V.II, pag. 316, (ed. A. Semikhatov, M. Vasiliev, V. Zaikin) Scientific World 2001.
 - [20] E. Elizalde, E.J. Ferrer and V. de la Incera, hep-ph/0209324 (Phys. Rev. D in press).
 - [21] V. P. Gusynin, V. A. Miransky, and I. A. Shovkovy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 3499 (1994); Phys. Lett. B **349**, 477 (1995); Phys. Rev. D **52**, 4747 (1995); Nucl. Phys. B **462**, 249 (1996); *ibid* **563**, 361 (1999).
 - [22] K.G. Klimenko, Z. Phys. C **54**, 323 (1992); D.-S Lee, C. N. Leung, and Y. J. Ng, Phys. Rev D **55**, 6504 (1997).
 - [23] G.W. Semenoff, I. A. Shovkovy, and L.C.R. Wijewardhana, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **13**, 1143 (1998); W. V. Liu, Nucl. Phys. B **556**, 563 (1999); K. Farakos and N.E. Mavromatos, Phys. Rev. B **57**, 3017 (1998); E.J.Ferrer, V.P. Gusynin, and V. de la Incera, Mod. Phys. Lett. B **16**, 107 (2002); Eur.Phys.J.B **33**, 397 (2003); V.P. Gusynin and V. A. Miransky, cond-mat/0306143.